

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

**JEFFREY SCHARRINGHAUSEN and  
DOUG STRAHM, individually and on  
behalf of all others similarly situated**

**Plaintiffs,**

**v.**

**SOLUTIA INC. EMPLOYEES'  
PENSION PLAN, et al.,**

**Defendants.**

**Case No. 06-CV-99-DRH**

**ORDER**

**HERNDON, District Judge:**

This matter comes before the Court on Applicants'<sup>1</sup> Motion to Intervene (Doc. 17). On its face, the instant matter seems appropriate for intervention pursuant to **FEDERAL RULE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 24(b)(2)**. Further, the parties in the instant matter do not specifically object to the Motion to Intervene. Accordingly, the Court **GRANTS** Applicants' Motion to Intervene (Doc. 17). Applicants will now be referred to as "Plaintiff-Intervenors."

Attached to their Motion to Intervene (Doc. 17) as Exhibits C and D, respectively, were the following: Plaintiff-Intervenors' Motion to Stay and Memorandum in Support of the Motion to Stay. Plaintiff-Intervenors are hereby

---

<sup>1</sup> Applicants are attorneys for Plaintiffs in the pending case of ***Davis v. Solutia*, Case No. 05-CV-736-DRH**, also filed in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois.

allowed to file this motion and supporting memorandum, but because these do not already appear on the docket, they cannot be deemed filed *instantly*.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Signed this 10<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2006.

/s/ David RHerndon  
**United States District Judge**